

**Voting Equipment  
Meeting Notes  
May 16, 2003**

**Members:** Dick Dodge, Pam Finlayson, Dee Ann Hart, Laura Herzog, Ruth Hibbard (proxy for Linda Grass and Clinton County Clerk & President of Association of Indiana Circuit Court Clerks), Brad King, Jon Laramore, Martha Padish, Kathy Richardson, Kristi Robertson, Secretary of State Todd Rokita, Robin Winston. Facilitators: Sarah Taylor and Anita Kolkmeier

**Others Present:** Karen Daily (Benton County Clerk), Cris Fulford (Attain), The Honorable Sue Anne Gilroy (former Indiana Secretary of State), Carolyn and Ashley Grayson (ADG ), Dale Simmons (Indiana Election Division), Kelly Sprague (Manatron Inc.), John Williams (Shelby County Election Deputy), Julia Vaughn (count Us In), The Honorable Sharon Priest (former Arkansas Secretary of State and affiliated with ADG)

Secretary Rokita called the meeting to order. He then introduced special guests Secretary Sharon Priest, former Arkansas Secretary of State, and Secretary Sue Anne Gilroy, former Indiana Secretary of State. Secretary Priest said that she was pleased to be here and was very impressed by the draft plan and the work of the team. She said Secretary Rokita's idea to use subgroups was a stroke of genius. She noted that the decisions that the voting equipment subgroup make are vital because this is what the voters will use. She also complimented the members for coming to the table knowing the information and having done their homework. Her one piece of advice was training voters. She closed with saying that Indiana will be a model state.

Secretary Gilroy followed with her comments. She said that she is happy to sit next to Secretary Priest and hear her high regards for the team and she concurs. She said that the level of education and knowledge is remarkable from where we started. She commented that she knows that there are good officials watching over the election process.

Secretary Rokita said (to Secretary Gilroy) we pulled out her file and she had paved the way for the team's current progress.

Secretary Rokita then turned the meeting over to facilitator, Sarah Taylor. Sarah asked if there were any corrections or additions to the meeting notes from May 9, 2003. She specifically asked Ruth Hibbard if meeting notes from May 9, 2003 clearly stated her comments regarding the vendor buyout issue. Ruth said the meeting notes were accurate with her comments. Laura Herzog thanked Sarah and Todd for correcting the meeting notes from April 25, 2003 and capturing her thoughts.

Sarah then asked the subgroup about the issuance of a QPA for ballot printing. Martha Padish said that they use their voting equipment vendor; Laura and Kathy said that they do their own printing. The group did not see how the issuance of the QPA gives benefit to either DRE or Optical scan counties. There was no consensus on this issue .

Jon Laramore suggested putting the ongoing cost of printing into the QPA. Robin asked if there were any standards for the ballot. Dee Ann recommended 18 point type. Brad and

Kristi confirmed that there were no standard in statute in terms of legibility and only a few general standards, for example, names in uniform size and date of election on ballot.

Secretary Rokita then asked whether or not HAVA money should be used for on going costs for counties. The group decided that this would be discussed in connection with Pam and Laura's documents.

Pam and Laura then handed out their calculations for each county. The documents included: Summary of Expenditures, Adams County, Counties Tier I, Counties Tier II, Counties Tier III, and DRE Machine Allocation Tier I, DRE Machine Allocation Tier II. Pam apologized for this was the first time that the members saw the documents. She explained that the Summary of Expenditures included the grand totals and the other documents supported those numbers. Everything was calculated on a per precinct basis. Tier I & II calculations used 2 DRE's per precinct and Tier III calculations used 1 DRE per precinct. Pam pointed out that she relied on the QPA for information on ES & S and Hart. She also took the price of 4 different vendor's DREs and averaged them to come up with the DRE amount.

Jon asked if counties that already bought optical scan get reimbursed for their ADA accessible machines. Pam said that under her calculations all counties are assumed to be eligible for reimbursement. Pam then pointed out that we don't know how much they spent. Kristi said that had that information.

Next the group briefly discussed the time allotted for voting. Pam said that voters are allowed 3 minutes (in statute) to vote but in Tippecanoe 4 – 4.5 minutes is average time used by voters.

Dee Ann stated that if you don't have training of officials or voters the new equipment will not work. Kathy Richardson added that training can be absorbed at the local level but counties cannot absorb the cost of equipment. Dee Ann added that making the site accessible should be left up to the counties but education and training is an important issue for which to consider using HAVA funds.

Robin thought that the documents presented by Pam were outstanding, but he questioned whether she had taken out the number of absentee voters and if the number included replacement machines. Pam said no. Robin then questioned if less machines would be needed. Pam said no they would not need as many machines. Kristi pointed out the because the estimates were based on precincts (and HAVA only requires one DRE per polling location), the counties can reallocate the machines according to sites.

Pam indicated that Tier II may be miscalculated. Kathy asked if the software was included. Pam said if she could get the information from the vendor then it was included. Kristi noted, from other election director's emails, that the average cost of a DRE is \$4000, including software and hardware. Kristi said the problem with the last QPA was that there were no touchscreen counties at that time to discuss the amount of money that they spent. Pam said that the real sources for her information were the counties. Dick Dodge then questioned the amount of the software and the burden that this would have on the counties, especially the smaller counties.

Robin asked what the vendor would say if our RFP simply said that we will only pay \$4000 for each machine and no more. Pam said that may drive the vendors out of the state and then cause a disservice to the counties with machines from those vendors that leave the state. Robin indicated that he is worried about supply but Pam said that we are not all going to the same vendor. Pam pointed out that there are 3 vendors – ES & S, Diebold, and Microvote. Kristi added VTI in Cass County. Pam suggested looking at how many from each vendor and see if they can supply them. Secretary Rokita asked if we want to spend HAVA dollars on ongoing costs. He added that HAVA dollars was a one time shot in the arm. ***The consensus was that we don't want to spend money on ongoing costs, like printing or machine maintenance for example.***

Sarah then questioned the issuance of a new QPA? Dick asked if 3 vendors will keep it competitive. Kristi answered that we have good information to get accurate QPA price. Brad added that we have vendors who have new products and services to add to the QPA. Jon thinks that it is a good idea to publish information from each county so counties can benchmark where they are. Sarah asked if there is a period of time that the QPA is subject to questions before it is posted. Kristi said yes there is a negotiation period.

Kathy asked if the group felt comfortable with the formula from last week now that the group had additional information. Pam said that now it is a timing issue – when and how much. Brad reminded the group that this is part of a 3 year process and that we can come back and amend the plan. He then said that if we are reasonably comfortable, we should go forward. He also noted that we have the reserve fund. Pam then said “we don't intend to spend like drunken sailors.” Any money can be reallocated. Robin said we should increase the amount for training and education on voting equipment. Martha then asked about the requirement for training. Brad informed the group of the new law which requires both inspectors and judges to be trained. Robin suggested backing out absentee voters, but Pam said that we can not reduce number of machines. Robin then suggested using \$39 million for voting equipment instead of \$40. He said that we could find a vendor for \$39 million.

Jon then explained the amounts per precincts for each tier per Pam's calculations:

Tier I – 9,200

Tier II – 8,200

Tier III – 4,700

Pam asked if we wanted to reimburse 100%. Jon said that counties would not be reimbursed 100%.

Kathy suggested dividing the money evenly among the 5600 precincts. She said this is justified because counties will know the amount that they are getting and those that have already bought new machines still have the cost of accessible machines. Jon said that Tier III will not be able to document their cost.

Pam said that there should be guidelines for the reimbursement. Robin wants to impose a limit so that we can spend more money on training and education. Pam reminded the subgroup not to forget the precincts that need precinct readers. Robin suggested moving more money toward the training and education pot.

Secretary Rokita said that voter training funding needs to be a dedicated amount in the plan, and not just an “if” the precincts don’t spend the amount allocated for machines. The machines will sit alone and not be used without training and education.

***Consensus: \$7000 per precinct ( $\$7000 \times 5600 = \$39.2$  million). There will be guidelines for the reimbursement process. The original amount designated toward voting equipment (40.6 million) minus the amount above (39.2 million) goes toward training. If there are precincts that, after competitively bidding out for machines, do not need all of the \$7000, then remaining amount goes to strategic reserve.***

Brad said that the training and education subgroup has focused on state level training, i.e. creating a state produced training video that will be available to the counties. Sarah noted that included in the plan is a county application process to fund training.

Jon is concerned that if we give Tier III \$7000, they will not be able to spend it. He is also concerned about Tier I counties that could jeopardize Indiana’s share of HAVA funding if they can not comply because they don’t receive enough money. Jon also suggested giving them the software amount. Kristi said that could range from 35,000 to 75,000.

Todd asked if there were any QPA spec requirements and for a QPA deadline. Kristi said that the QPA will not take as long as it did the first time around. Kathy said that the counties need a number soon because budget planning was coming up soon. Kristi said that they can make available the amount that counties have already spent. Dan Gettlefinger, Indiana Department of Administration, said that 90 days is the quickest time for the QPA. Brad speaking as a member of training and ed is concerned with timing. He thinks we should plan for expenditures in 2004 due to higher voter turnout.

#### **Public Comment:**

Julia Vaughn: She hopes that the proposal includes Pam’s statement about not spending like drunken sailors. Marion County is a perfect example that we better have poll workers who know how to set up and work the machines. She is glad to hear that more money is going to training, but is less than 5% enough.